UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/549,398	06/19/2006	Eldad Torbati	64030(303625)	6381	
	7590 01/20/201 NGELL PALMER & D	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 5587	<b>'</b> 4	NGUYEN, HIEN NGOC			
BOSTON, MA	02203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3768		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/20/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/549,398	TORBATI, ELDAD		
Examiner	Art Unit		
HIEN NGUYEN	3768		

	HIEN NGUYEN	3768			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affida al (with appeal fee) in complian	avit, or other evidence, w ce with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire latexaminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set fo ter than SIX MONTHS from the ma b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN T	ling date of the final rejection	on.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the street set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later to may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amou nortened statutory period for reply o	nt of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	sideration and/or search (see N v);	OTE below);			
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			ie issues ioi		
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed.</li> </ul>					
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-13,15,17,19,20,24-29,31-54,56,58,60, Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14,16,18,21-23,30,	ded below or appended. 61,65-70,72-79,81,82 and 84.	will be entered and an e	xplanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under app	peal and/or appellant fail	s to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
<ul> <li>11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)</li> </ul>					
13. Other:					
/Long V Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768	/H. N./ Examiner, Art Unit 37	68			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues reference EP 1,219,278 alone and in view of other references (Tamarkin, Ella, Hansjurgens, Cosman, Lia) does not teach and provide a motivation for transmitting ultrasound wave at a minimum intensity of 1.5 W/cm2. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the ultrasound system discloses by EP 1,219,278 and in view of Ella is capable of operating at an intensity of 0.5W/cm2 to 10 W/cm2. Further, Ella discloses in claim 100 that the ultrasound system is adapted for treating cellulite and fat. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify EP 1,219,278 with Ella in order to operate the ultrasound system at a minimum intensity of 1.5W/cm2 for cellulite/fat treatement because this is a minimum intensity for breaking down fat. Applicant argues it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify EP 1,219,278 with Tamarkin because Tamarkin's device is intended for achieving a fundamentally different purpose. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Tamarkin discloses an interferential electrical stimulation apparatus for treatment of skin and muscle (see [0014], [0021], [0027] and claim 23). Skin and muscle are part of the body perimeter. Tamarkin provides the same function of stimulating the body or the region of treatment as the ultrasound system in EP 1,219,278 therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the two references. Applicant argues Tamarkin does not disclose simultaneous application of ultrasound and interferential stimulation to the region of treatment. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because examiner relies on EP 1,219,278 combines with Tamarkin to teach a simultaneous application of ultrasound and interferential stimulation to the region of treatment.